

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MARTHA STEELE	:	: CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	: NO. 02-CV-4347
	:	
HCI DIRECT	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this _____ day of January, 2003, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to stay (docket no. 6) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.¹ It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for an enlargement of time to file her acceptance of her court-appointed attorney (docket no. 12) is **DENIED AS FRIVOLOUS**.²

BY THE COURT:

BRUCE W. KAUFFMAN, J.

¹ In her motion to stay, Plaintiff requests that the Court stay this action to allow Plaintiff time to obtain counsel. By Order dated September 23, 2002 (docket no.10), the Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel and, by Order dated January 6, 2003 (docket no. 11), the Court appointed Karin Gunter, Esquire as Plaintiff's counsel.

² Plaintiff's motion for an enlargement of time requests an extension of "the period to refuse or accept specific appointed counsel". As there is no specified period of time in which Plaintiff must move for appointment of new counsel, the Court finds this motion frivolous. See, e.g., Ely v. U.S. Postmaster General, 1990 WL 520, at *1 (E.D. Pa. January 2, 1990) ("On the eve of trial, plaintiff became disenchanted with her court appointed counsel [and]... [t]he court granted counsel's motion to withdraw and appointed new counsel for plaintiff.").

